

Appl. No. 09/369,790
Reply to Examiner's Action dated 03/23/2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants have carefully considered this application in connection with the Examiner's Action and respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-37 in the application. The Applicants have amended Claims 1, 10, 19, 25 and 31, cancelled claims 9 and 18 without prejudice or disclaimer, and added new Claims 38 and 39. Support for the amended claims is found on pp. 23-24 of the application. Support for new Claims 38 and 39 is found on page 23. Accordingly, Claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19-39 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3-7, 10, 12-16, 19-31 and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,815,709 to Waldo, *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,615,400 to Cowsar, *et al.*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,561,800 to Sabatella. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, because the combination of Waldo, Cowsar and Sabatella does not teach or suggest each and every element of the amended claims.

Amended independent Claims 1, 10, 19, 25 and 31 contain the limitation of filtering textual information in an interface. The Examiner has conceded that the combination of Waldo, Cowsar and Sabatella does not teach this limitation. (*See* Examiner's Action, p. 7.) The Examiner relies on U.S. Patent No. 6,505,160 B1 to Levy for "filtering" in his rejection of Claim 9 (cancelled herein). (*See id.*) But the Applicants do not find where the cited combination renders obvious amended

Appl. No. 09/369,790
Reply to Examiner's Action dated 03/23/2006

independent Claims 1, 10, 19, 25 and 31, since the filtering in Levy cited by the Examiner is filtering of audio files, not textual data. (*See col. 9, lines 55-61.*)

Therefore, the combination cited by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the amended independent Claims, and a *prima facie* case of obviousness fails. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 10, 19, 25 and 31, and those claims depending therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner has rejected Claims 8, 17 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waldo, in view of Cowsar, further in view of Sabatella, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,991,774 to Tate. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, because the combination of Waldo, Cowsar, Sabatella and Tate does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims.

As set forth above, the combination of Waldo, Cowsar and Sabatella does not teach or suggest filtering textual information in an interface. The Examiner does not cite Tate for this element, and the Applicants do not find any teaching or suggestion of this element in the cited combination. Thus, the combination of Waldo, Cowsar, Sabatella and Tate fails to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of the amended independent claims. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 8, 17 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2, 11 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waldo, in view of Cowsar, further in view of Sabatella, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,548,759 to Lipe. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, because the

Appl. No. 09/369,790
Reply to Examiner's Action dated 03/23/2006

combination of Waldo, Cowsar, Sabatella and Lipe does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims.

As set forth above, the combination of Waldo, Cowsar and Sabatella does not teach or suggest filtering textual information in an interface. The Examiner does not cite Lipe for this element, and the Applicants do not find any teaching or suggestion of this element in the cited combination. Thus, the combination of Waldo, Cowsar, Sabatella and Lipe fails to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of the amended independent claims. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 2, 11 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner has rejected Claims 9 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waldo, in view of Cowsar, further in view of Sabatella, as applied to Claims 1 and 10, and further in view of Levy. Because these claims have been cancelled, the Examiner's rejection is moot.

II. New Claims 38 and 39

The Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 38 and 39 are novel and nonobvious over the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicants earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance of these claims.

Appl. No. 09/369,790
Reply to Examiner's Action dated 03/23/2006

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19-39.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC



J. Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: June 23, 2006

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800